

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-27 have been examined. Claims 28-30 have been added. Claims 1-30 are all the claims pending in the application.

Formal matters

Applicant thanks the Examiner for accepting the drawings as filed on March 24, 2004, and for acknowledging the claim to foreign priority and receipt of the certified copy of the priority document.

Claim rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6, 11-17, 20, 22-24, and 26-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,538,698 to Anderson. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

For example, claim 1 recites the feature of displaying a plurality of principal image frames on the display panel arranged along a first line, and displaying at least one intra-group image frame on the display panel arranged along a second line different from the first line, the principal image frame being different from the intra-group image frame. The Examiner maintains that this feature is disclosed by Anderson at Fig. 11B and col. 7, lines 61-64. However, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's position.

In Anderson, a stream of images are ordered in accordance with a plurality of chosen categories. (see col. 6, lines 27-31). The images may be displayed as thumbnails 700 across the

top of a display 402 as shown in Figs. 7 & 8A. The images may also be sorted into a number of categories. (see col. 6, lines 31-37). A first image in each category group may displayed as a single image. Thus, as shown in Fig. 11A, the boxes “1”, “4”, “9”, “10” displayed as thumbnails across the top of screen 402 represent a first image in each of the categories shown in Fig. 7. In Fig. 11B, Anderson shows that the first image “4”, which is selected as indicated by the notch of selection arrow line 702, of category two is displayed both in the top thumbnail 700 section and in the bottom large thumbnail 704 section. Accordingly, Anderson does not disclose displaying principal image frames along a first line and at least one intra-group image frame along a second line different from the first, where the principal image frame and the intra-group image frame are different from each other, as recited by claim 1. (See element C.) Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over Anderson for this reason.

Claims 20 and 24 recite similar features to claim 1, and accordingly are patentable over Anderson for the same reasons.

The remaining claims are patentable based on their respective dependencies.

Claim rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 7, 8, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Anderson in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,341,168 to Nagasaka.

Claims 7, 8, and 19 depend from claim 1, which has been shown above to be patentable over Anderson. Nagasaka does not cure the deficiencies of Anderson. Thus, Applicant

respectfully submits that claims 7, 8, and 19 are patentable over the Nagasaka and Anderson combination.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Anderson in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0154190 to Misawa.

Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c), subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under one of § 102(e), (f), and (g), shall not preclude patentability under § 103 where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the claimed invention was made, subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Applicant respectfully notes that Misawa qualifies as prior art under § 102(e). Moreover, both Misawa and the instant application are assigned to FujiFilm Corporation. U.S. Patent and Trademark Office assignment records show that the assignment in Misawa was recorded on February 14, 2003 at Reel/Frame 013777/0148. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that at the time the claimed invention was made, the subject matter of Misawa and the claimed invention were subject to an assignment to the same person. As such, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(c), the subject matter of Misawa shall not preclude the patentability of the claimed invention.

Since none of the remaining references of record, alone or in combination, teach all the features of claim 9, as acknowledged by the Examiner, Applicant respectfully submits that the claim 9 is patentable, and thus Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Anderson in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,965,403 to Endo.

Claim 18 depends from claim 1, which has been shown above to be patentable over Anderson. Endo does not cure the deficiencies of Anderson. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 18 is patentable over the Endo and Anderson combination.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin C. Kunzendorf
Registration No. 58,308

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 30, 2007